

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
2 SULLIVAN, LLP

James R. Asperger (Bar No. 83188)

3 jamesasperger@quinnemanuel.com

Yury Kapgan (Bar No. 218366)

4 yurykapgan@quinnemanuel.com

Pushkal Mishra (Bar No. 298695)

5 pushkalmishra@quinnemanuel.com

6 865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor

7 Los Angeles, CA 90017

Telephone: (213) 443-3000

8 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

9 Victoria F. Maroulis (Bar No. 202603)

10 victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com

555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor

11 Redwood Shores, CA 94065

12 Telephone: (650) 801-5000

13 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

14 Counsel for Plaintiff BlackBerry Limited

Jordan R. Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22nd Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

BLACKBERRY CORPORATION

Edward R. McGah, Jr (Bar No. 97719)

emcgah@blackberry.com

Vice President, Deputy General

Counsel—Litigation

41 Ticknor Place

Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Telephone: (650) 581-4750

15
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18 BLACKBERRY LIMITED,
19 a Canadian corporation,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 TWITTER, INC.,

23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Defendant.

Case No. 2:19-cv-01444-GW-KS

**BLACKBERRY LIMITED'S
SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM
REGARDING '351 AND '929
PATENTS**

1 On September 5, 2019, the Court deferred ruling on Twitter, Inc.’s “motion to
2 dismiss related to the ’351 and ’929 Patents until a final ruling has been issued” in the
3 related cases *BlackBerry Limited v. Facebook, Inc. et al*, Case No. 2:18-cv-01844-GW-
4 (KSx) and *BlackBerry Limited v. Snap Inc.*, Case No. 2:18-cv-02693-GW-(KSx)
5 “regarding whether those patents are patent-eligible” and the parties have each briefed
6 the Court “stating how a determination of § 101 patent-ineligibility of the same asserted
7 patents in those other cases should impact Twitter’s motion in this case.” Court’s
8 Tentative Ruling at 13, Docket No. 47. BlackBerry Limited respectfully submits that
9 any “determination of § 101 patent-ineligibility of the same asserted patents in those
10 other cases should” apply equally to Twitter’s motion in this case.

1 Dated: September 10, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,

2 By /s/ James R. Asperger

3 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
4 SULLIVAN, LLP

James R. Asperger (Bar No. 83188)

5 jamesasperger@quinnemanuel.com

Yury Kapgan (Bar No. 218366)

6 yurykapgan@quinnemanuel.com

7 Pushkal Mishra (Bar No. 298695)

8 pushkalmishra@quinnemanuel.com

865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor

9 Los Angeles, CA 90017

Telephone: (213) 443-3000

10 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

11 Victoria F. Maroulis (Bar No. 202603)

12 victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com

555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor

13 Redwood Shores, CA 94065

14 Telephone: (650) 801-5000

15 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Jordan R. Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

16 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22nd Floor

17 San Francisco, CA 94111

18 Telephone: (415) 875-6600

19 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

20 BLACKBERRY CORPORATION

Edward R. McGah, Jr (Bar No. 97719)

21 emcgah@blackberry.com

22 Vice President, Deputy General Counsel—

Litigation

23 41 Ticknor Place

24 Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

25 Telephone: (650) 581-4750

26 Counsel for Plaintiff BlackBerry Limited